



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

If it were mere nominal Christianity, yes. But if all were possessed of the real spirit of Jesus Christ, war would be absolutely inconceivable, whatever differences of view might remain. One almost shudders to see the name Christian applied to the two peoples now fighting in South Africa. To the fomenters of the war, can the name have any true application? At best, the Christianity on one side is narrow and ignorant; on the other self-righteous, proud, greedy and domineering. How much of this will stand at the judgment seat as Christianity, we shall leave to the *Observer* to figure out.

The *Observer* thinks an international tribunal improbable. Secretary Hay does not. Nor does the Senate, which ratified the Hague Convention on the 5th of February. Nor did the ninety-six distinguished men who drafted the Convention at The Hague. The present wars, however disheartening, cannot stop the operation of the mighty movements which are leading on to peace, which brought the Hague Conference into existence, and have substituted arbitration for war in more than three-fourths of the international disputes of the Nineteenth Century. These are moving steadily on like "the silent, everlasting stars," hidden only but not permanently affected by the storms of strife and war. The Hague scheme may possibly fail, though we do not believe it will, but a permanent international tribunal is as certain to come soon as the progress of civilization to continue. Only those of short vision and narrow horizon can fail to see this.

What the *Observer* means by civilization must be something very different from what is ordinarily meant by the term. A civilization which made men more and more anxious and willing to fight and increase their preparations for war would not be civilization. It is not civilization which produces modern armaments and spasms of war passion, but the remains or the revival of barbarism. It is more than likely that the coming Paris Exposition, an institution of civilization, has had much to do with preventing the Anglo-Boer war from becoming a great war and involving at least a part of Europe. That is the nature of all the institutions of real civilization.

It is not so certain that the immediate effects of the Hague Conference have been as small in regard to great wars as the *Observer* supposes. If that Conference had not been held under the lead of the Czar, it is almost certain that Russia would have taken advantage of England's present situation, and a great war would have been the result. The memory of the Conference and the Czar's loyalty to his high purpose in calling it have made him keeper of the peace during this critical period, when the restless and the ambitious elements in Russia would otherwise have been uncontrollable.

It is hardly fair to expect the Hague Conference to prevent any wars while as yet the machinery pro-

vided by it has not been finally adopted and put into operation. It ought to be remembered that a great institution like that of a permanent tribunal proposed by the Conference takes time to establish and develop its power and efficiency. Nor ought one to expect the hereditary fighting instincts of peoples and historic friction, like that between Boer and Briton, to disappear, under whatever influence, in an instant as if by magic. This expectation is the short-sighted mistake of all those who condemn or belittle the Hague Conference because it has not acted like a gigantic piece of sorcery and brought the world at once to universal and everlasting peace. The Conference, by the mere fact of its existence and splendid scheme for an international court, is a sufficient proof that Christianity and civilization, or, if you prefer, the sense of humanity and justice, have made great inroads into the field of instincts, passions and false ideals, out of which both little and great wars spring, and that the world is not moving toward an era of universal and perpetual war.

Universal peace is doubtless yet a good way off. Higher motives than mere hope of success must still be our inspiration to work for its coming. But the hope of it is not a faded and colorless thing. The air is full of talk about it, and the wicked and barbarous wars now going on have only served to bring it into clearer vision and to make an increasing number of the wisest and best in all civilized lands determined that its realization shall not fail.

A Lesson from the Latin Races.

Just before the Hague Conference a number of distinguished English journalists, including the editors of some of the most prominent dailies and weeklies, sent an address to the continental press earnestly inviting coöperation in the crusade of peace. Recently the Lombard Peace Union of Milan, Italy, in the way of reciprocation, sent an address to the English press reminding these journalists and others that the present time, when Great Britain is at war with the South African republics, is the opportune moment to do something of real value in controlling public opinion in the interests of peace.

It is instructive to notice that of the twenty-six journalists whose names were on the British address, a considerable proportion have been true to their professions and have done their utmost to bring the war to an end, as they had previously done to prevent it. The others have fallen away, and with the general English press have succumbed to the stupefying opiate of imperialism.

The Lombard Union address implores the "noble nation," now that "satisfying" victories have been won, to put an end to the war. It makes its appeal in the name of English love of liberty, as manifested in the support given by Great Britain to the cause of

Italian independence. It declares that, while Great Britain is powerful enough to win further victories over the little South African republics, she cannot do this without rendering herself odious to the very people in Italy and elsewhere who have looked up to her as "the ideal land of liberty." The British press is implored to conduct the nation back to its "high duty of civil and moral leadership," declaring that the country most advanced in civilization is thereby under obligation to take the first steps to restore peace. "The powerful ought to be generous."

What has impressed us most in this fine, pertinent Italian appeal is the experimental insight which it exhibits into the true nature of imperialism. It is the warning utterance of a sad national and racial experience. "The old imperialism," it declares, "has proved the ruin of the Latin races." Reading this sentence, one recalls at once the present humiliation and degradation of Spain, once the military terror of Europe and of the western hemisphere; the disappearance of the Portuguese from the world's attention; the present prostrate and helpless condition of Italy, sinking ever deeper into the quicksands of political, social and financial ruin with every effort to maintain herself as a military power. The decay of France under imperialism and militarism is not quite so advanced, but all the world is aware that it is going rapidly on, retarded only by certain peculiarly vital forces in the nation.

All these Latin peoples proudly cherished the principles, the instincts and the dreams of the old Roman imperialism, and it has ruined them, as the Lombard address avers. Italy, France and Spain once ruled the world with "the arm of flesh." They were above all others the fighting nations. They dominated ruthlessly by force. They built up great empires founded on might. They loved the sword. They gloried in beating down and triumphing over other peoples. But their glory has proved their ruin and shame. They have lost for the most part their colonial dependencies, those of France at the present time being held by a very uncertain tenure. Weakness and poverty have settled upon them at home. Fraud and corruption rule in their high places. They can never rise again on an imperialistic foundation. That is one of the plainest lessons of history.

This warning from Italy to England, and we may say also to this country, is doubly pertinent and "worthy of all acceptance." It comes not from sentiment, not from Anglophobia. It is the voice of centuries of history. It is a cry of pain, of solemn admonition, from the confused ruins of an imperialism, once mighty and proud, which has run its historic course and brought forth its legitimate results. It is the appeal of a group of workers who amid the ruins of the past are attempting to build up a new Latin civilization on the only basis on which the decadent Latin races can ever hope to rise again — on which

we are sure they will sometime rise into a splendor and a might which they have never known.

The present Anglo-Saxon imperialism is said to be simply an example of the working of the natural law of development of race and national life. If this is true, then we must accept decay, collapse and utter ruin as the final term in Anglo-Saxon development. We were recently told by a gentleman of intelligence, and more consistency than is usual in men of imperialistic thought, that this is exactly what we must accept; that we are in the current made by our destiny, and that we must go with the tide and be prepared calmly to accept the decay and disaster awaiting us at the end of our racial career.

This we dare to disbelieve. There is not a word of truth in it. Imperialism and militarism have no place in genuine Anglo-Saxon civilization. They are a poison injected into its blood, which will destroy its vitality, check its normal growth and imperil its God-purposed destiny. They are wild grafts of barbarism into its original stock, which prevent it from bringing forth its natural fruit. If ruin comes, it will not be the fault of our destiny, but of ourselves.

"The old imperialism," the Lombard address asserts, "has no place in modern civilization. The only imperialism at all compatible with this is that of a federation of autonomous states having among themselves and with the mother country those cordial relations which are determined by the exchange of services, of commerce and of ideas — relations which are strong and enduring, and unlike those imposed by warlike violence which are sure to lead to future reclamation and acts of vengeance."

But this is really not imperialism at all. It is a kind of federation built up by the consent and voluntary movements of the peoples themselves. Federation in this sense is an essential part of modern civilization, particularly of Anglo-Saxon civilization. The more of it we have the better for all nations and peoples. But the attempt to force federation faster than it ought to go, to combine with its natural processes those of violence and forceful subjugation is to build a structure part of iron and part of clay. That is the folly of Anglo-Saxondom to-day. It is the peril of England, in parts of whose empire the memory of conquest and violence will not die, but remains to breed discord and danger. It is the present peril of the United States, which is now for the first time in its history purposely and consciously making an effort to graft the wild branch of imperialism into its original stock of peaceful and voluntary federation.

Both England and America will do well for themselves to-day if they listen attentively and give immediate heed to the warning, prophetic voice that comes to them from Italy. To defy the great lessons of history is the maddest of all follies. To sacrifice the future welfare of a nation to present ambition and greed is as criminal as it is base and unworthy.